APPENDIX I

Vol. 33, No. 9 March 1, 1974

CONTINUING REPORTS ON THE ALA MIDWINTER MEETING
Chicago, Ill., January 20-26, 1974

ISAD COLA DISCUSSION GROUP

The Information Science and Automation Division and the Committee on Library Automation Discussion Group met on Sunday afternoon, January 20, under the chairmanship of Brian Aveney, Richard Abel and Co. The first half of the session was devoted to a series of reports on the progress of several library automation projects now in varying stages of development.

The second half of the program consisted of a panel discussion on developments that would facilitate the use of automated techniques in the book ordering process, particularly the development of a machine-readable book order record that could be used for communication between customer and vendor and vice versa. Members of the panel were John Kountz, Library Systems Project, California State University and Colleges; Emery Koltay, Standard Book Numbering Agency; Tom Brady, Baker and Taylor Co.; and John Knapp, Richard Abel and Co.

Mr. Koltay began the discussion with a description of the work now going on in ANSI Z39 SC/30 (American National Standards Institute, Standards Committee Z39 on Library Work, Documentation, and Related Publishing Practices, Subcommittee 30–Standard Account Numbers) to develop a scheme for creating a Standard Account Number (SAN). The intent is to identify uniquely libraries, book publishers, booksellers (retail and wholesale), and schools–in other words every unit that is involved in the book publishing and book selling process. The major problem is determining who should be assigned a number and which units should be identified. Earlier efforts to establish a standard account number foundered on this difficulty. What is now being developed is a SAN composed of 11 digits. The first six digits of the number will be assigned to the unit that pays the bill. The next digit will be a check digit, and the remaining four digits will be assigned to sub-units at the local level. It is hoped that by this means it will be possible to accommodate the various complex situations that may arise in which different units perform different functions, the most obvious being that one unit pays the bills for books ordered but another unit receives them. The book processing and ordering world has been divided into three categories–(1) booksellers (retail and wholesale), (2) libraries and library systems, and (3) schools and school systems.

As a means of testing the idea of the SAN, arrangements have been made for the R. R. Bowker Co. to assign Standard Account Numbers to units in the first category–booksellers. Members of the American Booksellers Association and the National Association of College Stores will receive Standard Account Numbers to be used on a trial basis. It is estimated that there are about 10,000 units in this category. The number of units in all three categories is estimated to be over 300,000.

The next speaker was Tom Brady, who described the efforts of Baker and Taylor to use automated techniques to attempt to standardize the book ordering process. These efforts began several years ago, and in 1969 the company developed and installed a system called BATAB (Baker and Taylor Automated Book System). Mr. Brady thought an automated book ordering system would include the several components: (1) the capability of a vendor to receive orders for books on magnetic tape (Great variations in order numbers, fund numbers, and so on, exist, and this problem must be addressed.); (2) the capability of a vendor to provide a customer a book status report, which would include the obvious information–date shipped, price, and discount; and (3) the capability of providing a library bibliographical information to be used within the library.

To accomplish these objectives, Mr. Brady thought that there should probably be standards for two different records, the record that a library would produce to order books and the record that would be used by a vendor for getting information back to a library (including reports on the status of books ordered).

Mr. Brady believes that the key to developing standard means of ordering books is the use of the ISBN (International Standard Book Number) and he closed his remarks by questioning whether librarians will use the ISBN in ordering books.

John Knapp, Richard Abel and Co., emphasized the idea that the library community needs a standard record for ordering books, and outlined the specifications for such a record. It needs to be machine-

readable for transmission on magnetic tape or over communications lines. Each record would request some kind of action regarding some bibliographic activity and should be more inclusive than exclusive. The record would be used for communicating from library to library, library to vendor (wholesaler, retailer, publisher), and vendor to library. Representative transactions would include book purchases, requests for catalog cards and sets, requests for machine-readable records, and possibly interlibrary loan requests.

Mr. Knapp described the possible data elements required, noting that in any one transaction only those data elements would be present that support the individual request. Bibliographical data elements would include those for author, title, edition, imprint, series, and "bibliographical surrogates" (ISBN, ISSN, LCCN). Information regarding the parties involved would include the sender and the receiver and could possibly incorporate use of the Standard Account Number. In addition the record should provide for information regarding the status of the action requested (book sent, book out of print, and so forth), accounting information, and finally information that the sender needs for his own internal needs.

Mr. Knapp then discussed the format of such a record, delineating the following specifications: it should be flexible, accommodate only the data elements necessary to support a particular request, allow definition of new data elements without great disruption, provide for variable length data strings, accommodate the library character set, be intelligible to the library community, and be usable with a variety of hardware. In conclusion, Mr. Knapp recommended a new record definition within the structure of the MARC format for the following reasons: the structure is adequate, the library community has the software to manipulate the MARC structure, MARC is well documented, and people understand it. There followed a discussion of some of the issues raised by Mr. Knapp's presentation, particularly with respect to the complexity of the proposed order record, the data elements required, and the different control numbers that would be used.

The final presentation of the afternoon was made by John Kountz, Chairman of the newly formed ISAD Standards Committee, who briefly described the kinds of technical standards in library automation that the Committee will be interested in, including the development of a format for a machine-readable order record. [*Kay D. Guiles*]

RTSD/RLMS DISCUSSION GROUP

The RTSD/RLMS Discussion Group met on Sunday afternoon and covered a variety of topics related to microforms. Representatives from several libraries described their policies concerning the servicing, bibliographic control, and lending of microfiche. Imre Jarmy of the Library of Congress explained the bibliographic arrangement and changes in the newly published *Newspapers in Microform: Foreign Countries, 1948-1972* (Library of Congress, 1973). Of major interest to acquisition and reference librarians using this bibliographic tool will be the new title index and the use of successive entry cataloging in listing the negative and positive microform newspaper files. [*Norman J. Shaffer*]

RTSD TECHNICAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATORS OF MEDIUM-SIZED RESEARCH LIBRARIES DISCUSSION GROUP

The meeting of the discussion group was held on the afternoon of January 21 under the chairmanship of David S. Zubatsky, Assistant University Librarian, Washington University Libraries, St. Louis.

The meeting opened with a report by Mildred E. Dugas, Assistant Librarian and Head of Technical Services, Ohio University Library, Athens, on the experience of her library in using the data base of the Ohio College Library Center, particularly in acquisitions work and cataloging. The Library has three terminals which are currently in operation from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Pre-order searching is done at a terminal at the rate of 50 to 60 titles per hour. Upon receipt of a publication, it is searched in the data base. If a Library of Congress (MARC) record is available, printed cards are ordered, the call number is picked up from the terminal display, and the book is labeled and sent to the shelves. If only a record other than a MARC record is available, the copy is laid aside to be handled by paraprofessional catalogers. The rate of searching and cataloging from data base records displayed on a terminal is 15 titles per hour. Mrs. Dugas stated that in the period from June 30, 1971, to December 30, 1973, it had been possible to drop 22 positions (17 due to increased efficiency) as a result of using machine-readable records. At the same time the number of titles cataloged increased from 28,816 in fiscal year 1970/71 to an estimated 36,800 in fiscal year 1973/74. The speaker felt that the savings in salaries compensated for the rental of equipment and service fees to OCLC.

The second part of the program consisted of a report by Edmond L. Applebaum, Assistant Director

(Acquisitions and Overseas Operations), Processing Department, Library of Congress, on developments at LC in the area of processing for the period July 1 to December 31, 1973. [The information presented by Mr. Applebaum is also available in the Semiannual Report, which appeared in the LC *Information Bulletin* for January 11 as Appendix I.] [*Paul W. Winkler*]

RTSD/CSD COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING OF CHILDREN'S MATERIALS

As a permanent committee, the Committee on Cataloging of Children's Materials is well into its second year. Formed as an ad hoc group under the direction of Priscilla Moulton in 1967 to discuss the problems in cataloging children's materials and to function as a liaison between librarians in the field and the Library of Congress, the committee met with such response that it became a permanent committee in 1971 under the auspices of RTSD/CSD. In 1969, at the recommendation of the committee, ALA endorsed the Library of Congress cataloging of juvenile titles as the "uniform national standard for cataloging of children's materials."

Winifred Duncan, Chicago Public School Libraries, convened the meeting Monday, January 21, and directed discussion to methods of publicizing the committee's existence. Publicity should also serve to highlight the Cataloging-in-Publication (CIP) Program, the use of the LC Annotated Cards (AC) in the CIP data for juvenile titles, and ALA's endorsement of LC's cataloging of juvenile books as the national standard for cataloging children's materials. Vehicles for publication discussed were articles in various professional journals and a program at the ALA Annual Conference in July. The committee consensus was that the program should consist of a slide presentation and a question-and-answer session with commercial processors and librarians from school and public libraries.

Shirley Lewis, Toronto, Canada, pointed out that Benny Tucker of the Library of Congress is in the process of revising Chapter 12, which deals with nonbook materials, of the Anglo-American Cataloging Code. She suggested that the committee request a copy of the draft to comment on. The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Miss Duncan reconvened the committee meeting on Tuesday morning with a further discussion of promotion of the Library of Congress AC cataloging and the July program.

William Gosling, manager of Library of Congress CIP office, gave a status report on efforts to encourage certain children's book publishers not yet in the CIP program to join in that important service to the library field. He stated there were only four major publishers not yet in the program.

Treva Turner, LC liaison to the committee, joined with Tom Sullivan of the H. W. Wilson Company (publisher of the *Sears List of Subject Headings*) in announcing a recent informal agreement between the Library of Congress and Wilson to discuss and keep each agency informed of new subject headings developed for children's materials and in sharing each agency's experiences to enhance LC/AC alternate subject heading development and interpretation as well as future editions of the Sears list. The editor of the Sears list, Barbara Westby, will participate in the exchange of information between LC and Wilson.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of the Annual Conference agenda. [*Treva Turner*]

RTSD RS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee of the Resources (formerly Acquisitions) Section of RTSD met on Monday evening and Tuesday afternoon, with the chairman, J. Michael Bruer of the University of Houston Libraries, presiding. Approximately 15 members and guests attended each session.

Following approval of the minutes of the Las Vegas meetings and the slate of candidates for the Resources Section for 1974/1975 selected by the Nominating Committee, reports were presented by numerous standing and ad hoc committees of the section and by representatives to other ALA groups. The ad hoc Acquisitions Award Committee recommended that the Resources Section Policy and Research Committee serve as a mock jury for 1973 to explore potential problems that might be encountered if an acquisitions award were approved. It was agreed to take no further action pending receipt of the report of the ALA Awards Committee. It was reported that the Serials Section voted overwhelmingly not to merge with the Resources Section at this time.

The U.S. National Libraries Task Force on Cooperative Activities, Work Group on a Standard Book Order Form, has been dissolved since ANSI Z-39, Subcommittee 36, has been activated to pursue this task and representatives of the three national libraries are members of this ANSI Subcommittee. Subcommittee 36 has made progress in developing a standard book order format and is cooperating with other Z-39 Subcommittees on standard account and supplier numbers, and also with groups investigating optical character recognition systems for the ordering of library materials.

The Work Group on Subscription Dealer Performance is making good progress in collecting information from subscription agents on the services they can perform for libraries and a report by William Katz should be completed before the ALA Annual Conference in July. A list of bookdealers for Latin America, Asia, and Africa is being compiled and should be available before the New York meeting if the procedures for making payment for reproducing and distributing it can be resolved.

The RTSD/AAP Joint Committee and the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee of the Resources Section have announced that a seminar on "Paperbacks: Acquisition, Distribution and Use" will be held on Monday, July 8, from 2 to 6 p.m. at the Annual Conference. In addition, tours of selected publishing firms, dealers, and wholesalers are being planned for Wednesday of the same week. Committee appointments recommended by the Vice Chairman-Chairman Elect were approved. It was confirmed that Peter J. de la Garza's list of subscription agents is being reproduced by the ALA Publishing Office and should be available by April.

The Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee reported that the meeting on January 21 was so well attended that it had been moved to a larger room. The projected series of six guidelines on the acquisition of various forms of library materials is progressing well: the issue on monographs has been published by ALA, the issue on serials and periodicals should be published before the New York Conference, an issue on out-of-print materials is at the second draft stage, one on microforms is in preliminary outline, one on dealer services is in the planning stage, and it is hoped that one on paperbacks will result from the Annual Conference program on this topic.

The Collection Development Committee is also planning a program meeting on July 8 at the Annual Conference on the allocation of funds in libraries and the support of collection development programs. A full day's program meeting on the methodology and subject approach to library collection development is also being planned for the 1975 Annual Conference in San Francisco. The Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee and the Joint Association of American Publishers/Resources and Technical Services Division Committee are also planning a San Francisco program meeting on "Book Selection Mechanisms and Decision Making from the Point of View of Both Librarians and Publishers." The Micropublishing Committee reported on further progress it has made in continuing discussions with representatives of the Microfilming Corp. of America and the Kalvar Corp. regarding the replacement of reels of microfilm of the *New York Times*, and with representatives of the Encyclopaedia Britannica ultra microfiche project regarding the count of bibliographical units and the microform viewers provided with the project. The Micropublishing Committee is also investigating the trend of micropublishers offering their products on diazo or vescicular, rather than silver emulsion, film stock. A request has been forwarded to form an Acquisitions Discussion Group for Medium Sized Libraries. Inevitably, discussion was held on the proliferation of discussion groups and on procedures ALA might employ to promote their effectiveness. [*Robert C. Sullivan*]

RTSD COMMERCIAL PROCESSING SERVICES COMMITTEE

Committee members, representatives of four of the major commercial processing services, and other visitors met on January 22 to discuss the format of the program which the committee is sponsoring at the ALA Annual Conference. The scope of the program will be confined to adult and college level materials for which processing services are available and will attempt to present the librarian with a realistic expectation of what individual processing services can and cannot do. It is anticipated that the format of the program will allow individual commercial processing services to discuss their services in a comparative manner. [*Mary Kay Daniels*]

RTSD PLANNING COMMITTEE

The RTSD Planning Committee met on Tuesday evening and Thursday afternoon with Richard Johnson of State University College, Oneonta, N.Y., presiding as chairman. During the course of the two meetings, the committee modified slightly the long-pending "Goals for Action" statement and forwarded the document to the RTSD board for approval. The board subsequently gave its approval without notation or changes. Barbara Slanker, ALA Office for Research, met with the group to explain the mission of her office, her recent activities, and resources at her disposal which might assist the work of the committee. The final session focused on a discussion of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science report, "A New National Program of Library and Information Service." [*Norman J. Shaffer*]

RTSD BOOK CATALOGS COMMITTEE

Work of the committee members focused on the preparation of "Guidelines" for librarians considering

the use of book catalogs. Draft sections of guidelines, as prepared by individual committee members, were reviewed both for content and format and were then to be edited for final compilation into a usable, informative document. When the copy of the document is near the final version, a questionnaire will be sent to commercial services preparing book catalogs. Information returned by the services will then be compiled and added to the Guidelines as an appendix to the options available to the librarian using such services.

[*Mary Kay Daniels*]

RTSD/RLMS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The second meeting of the committee was held on Wednesday afternoon under the chairmanship of Harold Morehouse of the University of Nevada at Reno. Stephen Salmon of the University of Houston reported that the RLMS Standards Committee had Don Avedon of the National Microfilm Association speak to the group concerning NMA-ALA relations and misunderstandings which occur between librarians and the microform industry. The Standards Committee also met with Ernest Toy, representing the California State University and College system, to discuss the recently distributed *Standards and Guidelines for the Procurement of Microfilm and Microfilm Equipment by the Libraries of the California State University and Colleges.* Mr. Salmon related that a full exchange concerning the strengths and weaknesses of the document took place at the meeting. Norman Shaffer of the Library of Congress reported to the Executive Committee on the activities of the RLMS Discussion Group and the Policy and Research Committee. *The Standards for Microfilming Library Card Catalogs* was reported by Charles LaHood of the Library of Congress to be in preparation for publication. He further related that the revision of the ALA Photoduplication Order Form had been completed and was ready for final approval.

The RLMS experiment of issuing on microfiche a compilation of papers entitled *Current State of Catalog Card Reproduction* was evaluated and deemed to have been a success. Joseph Nitecki of Temple University, who was responsible for coordinating the project, urged that a second collection of papers be issued in the same format. Mr. Nitecki agreed to solicit and collect papers for the second and third collections in the RLMS Micro-File series. The second collection will contain papers on catalog card reproduction received after the cutoff date for appearance in the first collection. While collecting supplemental papers to the first number, Mr. Nitecki will seek papers on library policies concerning the reproduction of serials. This third collection will cover such matters as reasons and cost factors that libraries have developed to determine in what format serials will be retained for the permanent collection.

[*Norman J. Shaffer*]

APPENDIX II

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS VIEW OF ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE ALA MARC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

by Henriette D. Avram

[Editor's Note: This paper is a statement of the Library of Congress' recommendation at the ALA Midwinter Meeting that a MARC advisory committee be appointed within the present structure of the RTSD/ISAD/RASD Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information (MARBI) and describes the Library's proposed relationship to such a committee. The proposals and recommendations suggested were adopted by the MARBI Committee during its deliberations at the Midwinter Meeting and are now in effect.]

During the conference, the Library of Congress suggested to the RTSD/RASD/ISAD Committee on Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information that a MARC advisory committee be formed to work with the MARC Development Office regarding changes made to the various MARC formats. The primary interest of the committee would be in the serial and monograph formats, although the committee would take an interest in and assume responsibility for reviewing changes in any of the MARC formats to insure that the integrity and compatibility of MARC content designators are preserved. The RTSD/RASD/ISAD committee decided that it would be the MARC advisory committee and asked that a paper be prepared proposing how such a committee would operate in relationship to the MARC Development Office.

Before a discussion of MARC changes, it is appropriate to make certain basic statements regarding MARC changes and the difficulties experienced by the MARC Development Office in evaluating the significance of a change for the MARC subscriber.

It would be naive to assume, in a dynamic situation, that even under the best conditions a MARC subscriber would never have to do any reprogramming. Changes in procedures, changes in cataloging, experience in providing the knowledge for more efficient ways to process information, additional requirements from users, and so on, have always been factors creating the need to both modify or expand an automated system. Programming installations always require personnel to maintain ongoing systems. Situations creating changes locally must exist and likewise, they also exist at LC.

Staff of the MARC Development Office give serious consideration to every proposed MARC change and its impact on the MARC subscribers. It must be realized, however, that it is not possible to evaluate fully the impact of each change because the significance of a change is directly dependent on the use made of the elements of the record and the programming techniques used by each subscriber. MARC staff cannot possibly know the details of use and programming techniques and capabilities at every user installation.

Each MARC subscriber evaluates a change in light of his operational requirements. Since the uses made of the data vary among users, there is rarely a consensus as to the pros and cons of a change. MARC staff are aware of the expense of changes in software and have made an attempt to solicit preferences in some cases for one technique over another from MARC subscribers when changes were required. In the case of the ISBD implementation, 10 replies were received from questions submitted to the then 62 MARC users.

The remainder of this paper describes what is included in the term "change," the various stimuli that initiate changes, and recommendations of how LC and the MARC advisory committee should interact in regard to changes.

The chart appended to this paper summarizes the addenda to *Books: A MARC Format* since the initiation of the MARC service. An examination of the chart will reveal that the number and the types of changes have not been too significant.

MARC CHANGES

The term "changes" is used throughout this paper in the broad sense, that is, to include additions, modifications, and deletions of content data (in both fixed and variable fields) and content designators (tags, indicators, and subfield codes) made to the format as well as additions, modifications, and deletions made to the tape labels. The concern is with changes made to all records where applicable or groups of records but not with the correction or updating of individual records as part of the MARC Distribution Service.

Changes as described above fall into several broad types: (1) addition of new fields, indicators, or subfield codes to the format; (2) implementation of already-defined but unused tags, indicators, subfield codes or fixed fields; (3) modification of content data of fields (fixed and variable); (4) changes in style of content in records, for example, punctuation; and

(5) cessation in use of existing fields, indicators, and subfield codes.

The following paragraphs are divided into two sections. Section "a" describes the stimulus for a change and the rationale for making it. Section "b" describes the LC position regarding the change and, where applicable, a recommendation to the MARC advisory committee.

Changes made to MARC records may be divided into the following categories.

Category 1: Changes resulting from a change in cataloging rules or systems

(a) Cataloging rules or systems fall into two distinct types: those made in consultation with ALA (RTSD/CCS/DCC) and those made by the Subject Cataloging Division to the subject cataloging system without consultation with ALA.

LC follows *AACR,* and since the MARC record is the record used for LC bibliographical control as well as the source record for the LC printed card and LC book catalogs (for those items presently within the scope of MARC), cataloging changes (descriptive and subject) are necessarily reflected in MARC. If the cataloging change is such that the retrospective records can reasonably be modified by automated techniques, these records are modified to reflect the change. Prior to MARC, this updating could not be provided to subscribers to LC bibliographic products and is one of the advantages of a machine-readable service. It has the effect of maintaining a consistent data base for all MARC users.

(b) Changes made in cataloging rules or systems will be made by the appropriate agencies. Once changes in cataloging rules have been made by the ALA (RTSD/CCS/DCC) committee, LC will consult with the MARC advisory committee with respect to their implementation in those cases affecting the MARC format.[1] Wherever possible, depending upon resources available, the number of records affected, and the type of change, the retrospective files will be updated and made available in one of two ways: If the number of records is small (to be decided by LC), the records will be distributed as corrections through the normal channels of the MARC Distribution Service. If the number of records is large, the records will be sold by the LC Card Division.

Category 2: Changes made to satisfy a requirement of the Library of Congress

(a) Since LC uses the MARC records for its own purposes, situations do arise in which LC has a requirement for a change. In most cases, the Library feels that the change would also be beneficial to the users. Under these circumstances the Library has carefully evaluated the implication of the change to the MARC subscribers and, in some cases, solicited their preferences and advice.

(b) If LC is required to make a change in MARC, the proposed change and the reason for the change will be referred to the MARC advisory committee. The MARC advisory committee will solicit opinions from MARC users as to whether or not to include the change in the MARC Distribution Service, and LC will abide by the committee's recommendation. If this decision is not to include the change, LC will implement the change only in its own data base.[2]

Category 3: Changes made to satisfy subscriber's request

(a) Subscribers have sometimes requested that a change be made to a MARC record. Where possible, within the limitation of LC resources, these requests are complied with. The Library, when considering such a request, has sought the opinion of the MARC subscribers, and if sufficient numbers of users were interested in the change, the change was implemented.

(b) Changes requested by subscribers will be evaluated by LC, and if considered possible to implement, the proposed change will be submitted by LC to the MARC advisory committee to solicit opinions from MARC users. If the committee recommends, LC will implement the change.

Category 4: Changes made to support international standardization

(a) LC plays a significant role in international activities in the area of machine-readable cataloging records. Much of the future expansion of MARC depends upon standards in formats, data content, and cataloging. In all these activities, the Library firmly supports AACR and current MARC formats.

Occasionally, in order to arrive at complete agreement with agencies in other countries, it becomes necessary for all to compromise. In all cases, however, the Library does not agree to changes in cataloging rules until the recommendation has been approved by the appropriate ALA committee.

(b) Changes resulting from international meetings will fall principally into two areas:

(1) Cataloging: if the change required is the result of a change in cataloging rules and the ALA (RTSD/CCS/DCC) has approved the AACR modifica-

tions, the MARC change falls into Category 1.

(2) All other changes affecting the format: since the Library of Congress is the agency in the United States that will exchange machine-readable bibliographic records with other national agencies, it will consider these changes an internal LC requirement; therefore, they can be considered under the proposal described in Category 2. The Library will submit the proposed changes to the MARC advisory committee.

Category 5: Changes made to expand the MARC program to include additional services

(a) If the MARC service were static, changes to expand the service would not be possible. An example of an additional service is the Cataloging-in-Publication data available on MARC tapes. Since this cataloging data is available four to six months before the publication of the item, it was determined to be of value to MARC subscribers and changes were made to the MARC record to make this data available in machine-readable form.

(b) If a new service is under consideration at LC that will cause a change to MARC records, such as Cataloging in Publication, LC will submit the proposal to the MARC advisory committee for their action as described in Category 2.

OTHER LC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE MARC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Time frame for changes

In order to prevent consultation on changes from taking an inordinate length of time, LC proposes that the MARC advisory committee be given two months to solicit comments from MARC users, to arrive at a consensus, and to respond to proposed changes. If there is no response during that time, LC will implement the proposed change. LC will notify the MARC subscribers two months before including the change in the MARC Distribution Service.

Consultation with the MARC advisory committee

The MARC Development Office will submit the recommendation for change and any other information required to evaluate the change to the MARC advisory committee. The MARC advisory committee will be responsible for submitting the proposal to the MARC users and notifying the MARC Development Office of the committee's recommendation.

Test tapes

The MARC advisory committee, on consultation with the MARC Development Office, will consider the requirement for a test tape to reflect the change made to the MARC record (the requirement for a test tape is dependent on the type of change made).

---

[1] Format change is used in this context to mean a change affecting the tags, indicators, subfield codes, addition or deletion of fixed fields, or change to the leader.

[2] An exception to this statement will be those changes to LC practice which must be reflected on cards and in the MARC record and which cannot exist in optional form. An example of the above would be abolition of the check digit in the LC card number.

ADDENDA TO BOOKS: A MARC FORMAT

Stimulus for Change	*Date*	*Change*	*Comments*
1. Cataloging Rules and Cataloging System Changes	1972	U.S./Gt. Brit. changed to United States and Great Britain.	Change made to facilitate machine filing.
	1972	ISBD	Cataloging change based on an international agreement.
	1973	ISBD–additional information	
2. Subscribers Requests	1972	Government Publication Code added to Fixed Field.	
3. Initiated at LC: a. Addition or Deletion of Fields	1969	Abolishment of 653–Political Jurisdiction (Subject) and 750–Proper Name Not Capable of Authorship	These little-used fields proved difficult to define and of little value.
	1970	Addition of Encoding Level to Leader	Implemented for use for RECON records.
	1970	Addition of Geographic Area Code field, tag 043	This field has been widely used by LC and subscriber libraries.
	1971	Addition of Superintendent of Documents field, tag 086	Information added to LC catalog cards (and thus to MARC records) at the request of outside libraries.
b. Additions of Indicators or Subfields	1971	Addition of Filing Indicators	Information needed to allow LC to ignore initial articles in arranging its computer-produced book catalogs.
	1972	Addition of "q" subfield to fields for conferences entered under place.	Subfield needed to enable LC to file conferences entered under place correctly.
c. Addition or change of codes or data to existing fields	1969	Code added to Modified Record Indicator in fixed field to indicate shortened records.	
	1969	Code for phonodiscs added to Illustration fixed field.	
	1970	Code added to Modified Record Indicator in fixed field to indicate that the dashed-on entry on the original LC card was not carried in MARC record.	
	1971	"Questionable Condition" codes deleted from Country of Publication code.	

Stimulus for Change	*Date*	*Change*	*Comments*
c. Addition or change of codes or data to existing fields (Continued)	1971	Geographic Area Code. Guidelines for implementation modified slightly and 23 new codes added.	
	1971	Microfilm call numbers carried in LC call number field.	Description of what such call numbers looked like.
	1971	Abolished LC card number check digit.	Numbers available using check digit too limited.
d. Explanations or Corrections	1970	Use of "b" subfield with Topical Subjects (Field 650) and Geographic Subjects (Field 651)	Subfield and its use inadvertently omitted from *Books: A MARC Format.* It occurs rarely in MARC records.
	1971	Use of "Revision date" as suffix to LC card number	Explanation of what this information means at LC and how subscribers might use it.
	1971	Indicators used with Romanized title.	Explanation of use of indicators with this field omitted from *Books: A MARC Format.*
e. Changes to labels	1972	Change to label to reflect new computer system at LC.	
4. National and International Agreement	1970	Standard Book Number (9 digits) changed to International Standard Book Number (10 digits) to conform to an international standard.	
	1971	Entry Map added to Leader to conform to national standard.	Adoption of ANSI Z39 Format for Exchange of Bibliographic Information.
	1971	Change to Label to conform to ANSI standard.	
5. New Services at LC	1969	Changes to label and status codes for cumulated tapes.	To provide for cumulative quarterly and semiannual tapes.
	1971	CIP records–addition of codes to Encoding Level and Record Status	